

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
11 AT TACOMA

12 ANTOLIN ANDREW MARKS,

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.

15 GARY GARMAN *et al.*,

16 Defendants.
17

Case No. C07-5282FDB/JKA

ORDER

18 This Bivens action has been referred to the undersigned Magistrate Judge pursuant to Title 28
19 U.S.C. §§ 636(b)(1)(A) and 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Magistrates' Rules MJR 1, MJR 3, and MJR 4.

20 Mr. Marks now litigates under a sanction as a result of improper filings. As part of that sanction
21 documents filed by Mr. Marks are submitted under seal for court review. Mr. Marks has filed one
22 documents since entry of the sanction order (Dkt. # 19). Document 19 is a request that the sanctions be
23 lifted. Mr. Marks has filed this motion in multiple cases. In Marks v Gephardt, 07-CV-5259RJB/JKA the
24 court denied the motion and stated:

25 The final motion which can be ruled on by a Magistrate Judge is plaintiff's motion to
26 remove the sanctions in this case (Dkt # 50). In August of 2007, plaintiff sent pleadings to
27 the court, which, by his own admission, contained "security details" from the facility where
28 he is housed. Plaintiff sent this document in hand written form and as a sealed filing.
Several days later, plaintiff presented the same information in typed form to the defendants,
allegedly for copying. Plaintiff avers he took these actions to prove his pleadings were
being read by the defendants. Plaintiff was immediately segregated. Plaintiff contends "the
Plaintiff did seek to make a point to the Court and to the Defendants. The point was well

1 made but not well taken” (Dkt # 50, page 2). Plaintiff is wrong in assuming he has proven
2 his pleadings were improperly being read. Nothing in the United States Constitution
3 prevents prison officials, or in this case detention officials, from scanning outgoing mail,
4 even legal mail. Allowing prison officials to scan outgoing mail helps insure the mail is
actually entitled to the privileged status the plaintiff claims. Further, scanning of outgoing
mail helps prevent a detainee or prisoner from sending out mail that contains plans to escape
or plans to conduct other illegal activity.

5 Even a cursory glance at Plaintiff’s August filings shows the documents are not
6 proper legal filings. The documents are a threat to the security of the facility and are not
entitled to any Constitutional protection.

7 The court’s reaction has been to seal the documents in question, (a lesser sanction
8 then dismissal of actions or a permanent bar order). Further, to insure plaintiff does not
9 again submit any improper pleading, the court considers each filing under seal and then
either enters an order that the document remains sealed or that the document be unsealed.

10 Plaintiff argues that the court indicating he submitted “improper filings” is
11 something much worse than what actually occurred (Dkt. # 50, page 2). Plaintiff’s filings
tell a different story. The documents filed warrant the ongoing sanction. Plaintiff’s motion
is **DENIED**.

12 (Marks v Gephardt, 07-5259RJB/JKA Dkt. # 51).

13 The court will not consider plaintiff’s motion in any other case as the motion has been ruled on.
14 Further, the filing of the same identical motion in multiple cases serves no valid purpose and is one of the
15 hallmarks of vexatious litigation. Plaintiff is cautioned to discontinue this practice.

16 The clerk’s office is directed to send copies of this order to plaintiff and counsel.

17
18 DATED this 25 day of January 2008.

19
20 /S/ J. Kelley Arnold
J. Kelley Arnold
United States Magistrate
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28